DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 286 880 SP 029 457

AUTHOR Maher, Frances; Dunn, Kathleen
TITLE The Practice of Feminist Teaching: A Case Study of Interactions among Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Female Cognitive Development. Working Paper No. 144.
INSTITUTION Wellesley Coll., Mass. Center for Research on Women.
SPONS AGENCY Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 69p.
AVAILABLE FROM Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, Wellesley, MA 02181 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Cognitive Development; College Students; *Comparative Analysis; *Course Content; *Education Courses; Higher Education; Liberal Arts; Self Concept; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; Teaching Methods; *Womens Education

ABSTRACT

A study sought to analyze the relationships among the content and pedagogy of introductory education courses at two women's colleges, and the students' self-awareness, views of knowledge, and sense of themselves as women. One of the courses, "Schooling in America," was offered by a liberal arts college concerned with equal career opportunities for women, while the course, "Schools in an Era of Change," was offered by a college that focused on preparing women for careers within the context of a liberal education. A case study method, including interviews, observations, and document analysis, was used to examine the three-way interaction among course content, course pedagogy, and student cognitive level. Results and comparisons of results between the two courses are discussed in terms of several stages of cognitive processing: (1) male and conpensatory scholarship, dualism, and the lecture-discussion mode; (2) bifocal scholarship, multiplism, and the discussion mode; and (3) multifocal scholarship, contextualism, and the inductive/interactive mode. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED286880

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Dunn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Objectives

II. Perspectives and Framework

A. Early Phases: Male and Compensatory Scholarship, Dualism, and the Lecture-Discussion Mode

B. Phase Three: Bifocal Scholarship, Multiplism, and the Discussion Mode

C. Phases Four and Five: Multifocal Scholarship, Contextualism, and the Inductive/Interactive Mode

III. Educational Settings and Practices

IV. Research Design

V. Data Analysis

A. Student Cognitive Level: The Initial Interview Data

B. Wheaton: "Schooling in America"

1. Course Content and Women's Experience
2. Pedagogy

C. The Students' Experience of "Schooling..." by Cognitive Stage

1. Specific Classes
2. The Course As A Whole: Final Course Writings and Interviews

D. Simmons: "Schools in an Era of Change"

1. Course Content and Women's Experience
2. Pedagogy

E. Students' Experience in "Schools in an Era of Change"

1. Fieldwork and Career Choice
2. Women's Roles
3. Overall Self-concept

VI. Conclusions

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I. OBJECTIVES

This study of the experiences of two introductory education courses at two women's colleges seeks to analyze the relationships between the content and pedagogy of these courses, and the students' self-awareness, views of knowledge, and sense of themselves as women. Through an analysis both of student thinking patterns and course experiences, we seek to describe some interactions between specific educational practices and students at different cognitive stages.

The design of these courses and of this study rests upon certain assumptions about the goals of the educational process, drawn both from more traditional models and from recent work on female development and learning. We assume that the purpose of education is to equip people with the knowledge, both of themselves and of their world, which permits them to make purposeful and active choices.

We have chosen two factors in curriculum design to help female students reach these goals. One is the inclusion of women's experiences in the content of undergraduate courses. The second is pedagogy which is democratic, "student-centered", and interactive. This pedagogy can help students to articulate their own experiences in relation to course themes, so that they may define a personal

perspective in relation to the larger social context provided by the curriculum.

Neither the work in female cognitive development nor the work in women's scholarship and curriculum building has yet focused on actual classroom practices. The above assumptions, that the new scholarship on women, coupled with an interactive pedagogy, will promote female development, have not been tested. It is the aim of this study to begin to explore and test these assumptions. We will describe two education courses: one explicitly including material on women and both employing an interactive, discussion-based teaching mode with exercises which draw on the students' own experiences in relationship to the themes of the course. Then, using student writings and a series of in-depth interviews, we will suggest some relationships between these courses and the students' perceptions of the courses and aspects of themselves.

II. PERSPECTIVES AND FRAMEWORK

Recently, in connection with the new scholarship on women's experience, efforts have been made to chart phases of integrating women into the traditional curriculum. Scholars in each discipline have begun by adding women's experiences piece by piece to their current curriculum, only to find that these new additions challenge and perhaps transform the prevailing content, concepts and methodology

of the discipline itself. (See Boxer, 1983; Tetreault,1982 and 1984; and MacKintosh, 1983, among others). For example, the inclusion of women's unpaid labor in the home under the category of "work" challenges some traditional definitions of the concept of work. Meanwhile, researchers in cognition are subjecting William Perry's male-derived concepts of stages of cognitive development to female examples and experiences, and discovering variations in cognitive stage theory as a result. (see Perry, 1970, and Clinchy and Zimmerman, 1982). In the design of this study, we have applied this "phase" theory of curricular integration and this stage theory of female cognitive development to an analysis of pedagogical techniques as well. First, are there pedagogical strategies which are especially appropriate for or expressive of each phase of curriculum integration? Secondly, if student cognitive development in college does proceed through stages, how are students at each stage affected by certain kinds of curricula and pedagogy?

In this research we have used Tetreault's phase theory of curricular integration to analyze the content of two education courses for their inclusion of women. (See Tetreault, 1982 and 1984; and McIntosh,1983)[1] We have also taped and analyzed variations in pedagogical techniques in these courses. Finally, we have employed Clinchy and Zimmerman's developmental framework and an interview schedule designed by their project (The Women's Development

Project at Wellesley college) to conduct and analyze student interviews. Although Clinchy, et. al., have suggested interesting differences between the stages outlined by Perry, using a primarily male sample, and their own findings with women, their questions (and ours) have not yet been extended to males. Therefore, we discuss the stages here as they apply to female students only. This study, then, considers the intersection of women's content, pedagogy, and female student learning. By inquiring into the relationship between the nature of the content and pedagogy of the courses and the cognitive stages of the female students,we hope to shed light on how students learned in these courses. In this introductory theoretical section we describe each phase of curricular integration, and suggest pedagogical methods which may be expressive of, or at least frequently used in, a given phase. We also describe the stages of cognitive development and the ways in which students at each stage may interpret the content and pedagogy offered at each phase of integration.

In our analysis we have discovered striking correspondences among the curricular phases, the pedagogies expressive of these phases, and student cognitive developmental stages. For example, "dualist" students think there is one right answer to everything, and "phase one" curricula represent a unitary view of the world. Why such a correspondence? Eventually these theories are all concerned with the increasing complexity of knowledge and thought

processes called for in the college curriculum and in the academic disciplines as scholars have constructed them. One way, however, of interpreting a study of women's scholarship in the disciplines and women college students' thinking is to characterize it as an initiation into the modes of thought, language, and skills of expression particularly associated with a college education, and with efficacy and success in our own society (although the inclusion of women is, at the same time, transforming those modes of thought). In other contexts different frameworks of development might well be more obvious and more useful for analysis. (For example, it's clear that many high school students and many older people who don't go to college also reason in complex ways about features of their own experience).

Furthermore, the stages of student thought patterns, and responses, do not of course automatically conform to the curricular phases or pedagogies of the courses which students are taking. In any given class around any given subject, student responses will vary tremendously. This study speculates upon the effect both of content and of pedagogy (adjusted for curricular phase) upon students at DIFFERENT cognitive stages. The theoretical scheme described below is summarized in a chart in Appendix A.

A. EARLY PHASES: MALE AND COMPENSATORY SCHOLARSHIP, DUALISM, AND THE LECTURE-DISCUSSION MODE

Traditional academic disciplines in Tetreault's phase one are womanless; the absence of women (and other oppressed groups) from the subject matter is not noted. Generalizations are made, and concepts are formed based on dominant group experience only. Traditional disciplines are hierarchically organized, and knowledge is seen as a property of levels of expertise. In phase two, women are included for the first time, but as tokens. We read about prominent women who achieve either in male terms (like Margaret Thatcher), or by male-defined standards of femininity (like Jane Addams, who helped the poor). When women as a group are included, they are portrayed, often uncritically, in traditional or stereotypic roles as wives and mothers. The basic structure of knowledge, as unitary and hierarchically ordered, is not challenged.

The first stage of cognitive functioning for students at the college level, according to Clinchy and Zimmerman, is the dualist mode. Dualist students believe that there is a right answer to questions, which exists outside and beyond themselves. Learning consists of receiving and then memorizing the correct information from a source, such as the instructor or text.

Both phase one and phase two scholarship assume a unitary view of the world, and the lecture is probably the most commonly used pedagogical format in such traditional courses. It is also the teaching method which dualist students prefer, because they are looking for the "correct"

body of information, to learn from the expert. Although the lecture format is an appropriate and often necessary pedagogical technique, it is this approach to the delivery of content which most allows dualist students to confuse the partial knowledge gained from a lecture with the complete "truth" in a given area. Furthermore, when traditional course content, taught through lectures, ignores the experiences of women and other minorities, female students at the dualist stage may learn the "right" answer, but may also learn to deny their own experience of the world. White male dualist students may find "objective" right answers that affirm salient aspects of their experiences, but female dualists may be rendered intellectually mute, learning to split their intellectual attainments away from their experiential knowledge. For example in a recent paper, Clinchy and Zimmerman find that some Wellesley students view college courses as alienating and disturbing intellectual games (Clinchy and Zimmerman, 1984). When "token" women are included in phase two lectures, female students may feel partially represented, but in ways that make female experiences inferior or, in the case of "tokens," impossible to emulate.

When discussions are used in phase one and two courses, their purpose is usually to help students formulate the themes of the course in a more complex way. That is, the instructor might structure a debate on an issue, or conduct a question-and-answer session on the meaning of a text, or

demand the proof of an hypothesis. Although the answers might be subject to legitimate disagreements of interpretation or alternative explanations, the overall framework and the choice of grounds for debate are still provided by the teacher. Dualist students tend to be impatient with such discussions, seeing them as roundabout ways of discovering what they think the teacher should have told them in the first place. But female students who are moving out of dualism begin to discover the stirrings of a personal voice, which is the hallmark of multiplism, Clinchy and Zimmerman's next cognitive stage. These students may see such structured discussions as helping them to develop their own views. It may be that these guided discussions, and the inclusion of some women, though on male terms, still help to validate female students' movement out of dualism and a personal silence.

B. PHASE THREE: BIFOCAL SCHOLARSHIP, MULTIPLISM, AND THE DISCUSSION MODE

In phase three scholarship and curricula, women are perceived for the first time AS A GROUP, rather than as a few individuals meeting male norms. Women's experiences are seen as different from those of males and equally valid. For example, not only are women's contributions as a group to formerly male areas noted, (as in women's part in the Progressive Movement), but female activities are considered

worthy of study on their own (as in the new attention to the home and the "private sphere"). Unlike the initial phases, phase three scholarship reveals new theoretical frameworks which challenge a unitary or hierarchical world view. Thus in psychology the works of Gilligan (1982) or Chodorow (1978) on female development demonstrate that traditional generalizations about adult maturity do not necessarily apply to women. What defines phase three is the description of women's experiences on their own terms, with theories which fit those experiences. In courses with a phase three content, women's and men's experiences are seen to lead to alternative theoretical frameworks and alternative, equally valid "truths."

Multiplism is the next cognitive stage in Clinchy and Zimmerman's work, wherein female students discover the validity of their own experience in determining their view of the world. While knowledge for the dualist comes from the outside, knowledge for the multiplist comes from within, a "gut feeling" that something is true, or "right for me." In discovering this personal voice, the multiplist student simultaneously comes to believe in that voice, which is the expression of her own experience and instincts, as the only possible touchstone for determining what is true. But this truth cannot be generalized to others, who have their own truth. Teachers and experts thus also have the right to their own opinion; they too have no wider grounding for it, however, than their own personal experience. An authority's

viewpoint is personally valid for the multiplist when it "fits" with her own. If it does not, there is no cognitive process available yet to integrate other truths or information from outside with the personal perspective from within.

In terms of pedagogy, lectures in phase three tend to present generalizations about women's experiences and compare them to male models. The teaching technique which is most expressive of a phase three content, however, is probably that which rewards a multiplist view of the world, namely discussions in which students are encouraged to match their own personal experiences to the themes of the course, (for example to see their lives as reflecting various aspects of gender identity or history). Discussions in phase one and two courses tend to take their content solely from the subject matter and major concepts of the course, excluding the realm of personal experience. Phase three discussions, however, encourage the use of personal experience in comparison to course concepts, thus rendering these concepts open to personal validation. "Is this true for me?"

What would be the likely effect of phase three content, and this type of dicussion, on students at different cognitive stages? Lectures in phase three present alternative frameworks for women's experiences and compare them to male models. Dualist students may simply learn from such lectures that there is one set of "right answers" for

women and another set for men. This validation of a "women's reality" may also help them move toward multiplism, or the recognition of a personal voice, through the public and academic expression of aspects of their own previously unvoiced experience. Experiential discussions may further promote this development. Students who are already multipists probably see such lectures and experiential discussions as partial validation of their own experience. They will tend to view the content of the lectures as essentially an expression of the teacher's own personal "truth", and discussions as a way of evaluating this "truth" in relation to their own experience.

However, there is a drawback to such approaches, which lies in the equation of personal experience with a "women's point of view." In fact, phase three curricula and scholarship reflect a fundamentally multiplist view of the world, in which women and men each have different truths. (Tetreault calls this phase "bifocal" scholarship.) Although Gilligan and others have tried to integrate male and female strands of experience, the main focus of such theories is still on differences. Discussions of "male" and "female" approaches thus result in generalizations which are compromises, or balances, but not the fuller integration that comes from a wider and more inclusive perspective. In phase three pedagogical approaches, exemplified by discussions of personal experiences attached to generalizations about women, this same multiplist view of

separate truths for separate people prevails.

C. PHASES FOUR AND FIVE: MULTIFOCAL SCHOLARSHIP, CONTEXTUALISM, AND THE INDUCTIVE/INTERACTIVE MODE

A new basis for women's scholarship arises from the research on women's experiences in phase three. As we move "women" to the center of our attention, we are forced to look at the variety and complexity of women's experiences, and see that the experiences of all oppressed groups, not only women but also many men, are equally valid as forms of human reality. It also appears that these human experiences do not stand alone, each with its own generalizatons. Rather, they stand in complex relations to each other, affected by each other. These relations can only be explained in a larger social and historical context, with a consideration of how class, race, and culture intersect with and transform considerations of gender.

In Tetreault's formulation of phases of curricular integration, phase four is "feminist scholarship", which looks at the variety, complexity, and multifaceted nature of the female experience instead of treating all women as a unitary group as does phase three. In phase five, multifocal scholarship, a still wider perspective "fuses women's and men's experience into a holistic view of human experience." (Tetreault, 1984, p.) Here, both differences

and commonalities between men and women of similar and different cultures, classes, and histories are sought. Because phase four seems in some ways a transition between three and five, we have put phase four and five together here. Both employ, according to Tetreault, the same methodology for the construction and validation of knowledge, namely the building of conceptual frameworks and generalizations from the specificity and variety of human experiences, in which the perspectives of all participants, not just the elite few, are encompassed. Both phase four and phase five scholarship seek the connection and mutual illumination between the public and private sphere, locating each along a single continuum of human experience. Thus both are also multidisciplinary.

The next full stage of cognitive development, called contextualism by Clinchy and Zimmerman, also reflects this concern with the integration of perspective. Multiplist thinkers, confronted with other views besides their own, begin over time to see connections and comparisons among these views. In the move towards contextualism, at the transition stage called "Limited Contextualism", students adapt their teachers' concerns with methodology, or the way in which "truth" is pursued in each discipline. They begin to try to back up arguments with facts. In so doing they move from the notion that all opinions are equally valid toward the realization that some arguments or theories are more plausible or inclusive than others; they begin to see

the internal methodological approach and structure of particular disciplines. Then, with the approach of full contextual thinking, they start to relate the disciplines to each other, and to integrate their personal with their intellectual and academic lives. In the development of full contextual thinking, students first realize that they can share common experiences, that their individual experiences do relate to each other. Secondly, they discover that one's own perspective, while valid, is just that, a perspective. The student thinking contextually sees herself (and the teacher) as a knower and a meaning maker. She accepts her own viewpoint, but also seeks to relate it to the wider arena of other viewpoints and other experiences so as to move beyond it. Knowledge is seen as neither an exterior product to be ingested, as in dualism, nor as a set of personal opinions, as in multiplism, but as an evolving construct, created by the self through the analysis of a complex and changing reality.

This process of knowledge construction is one in which the personal inner voice uncovered in multiplistic thinking is subject to influence, change and growth through interaction with outside perspectives and outside realities. In the stage of multiplism, everyone is" stuck" in their own truths and their own separate reality, (as are men and women in bifocal scholarship). In contextual knowing and learning, truth is relational, interdependent, evolving, and constructed through a comparison of multiple perspectives

which can be defined through specific contexts. The sources of each person's individual perspective must be examined as they relate to the formation of that perspective. The multiplist, although full of a sense of self, has trouble separating out or defining specific attributes or qualities of that self, because self-definition (as opposed to self-discovery) depends upon comparison with other people and other personal histories. The contextualist, on the other hand, can see herself as possessed of certain experiences and qualities which she realizes contribute to her particular perspective. She can, then, allow her perspective to broaden and change.

In Tetreault's formulation, phase four and five curricula must pay attention to a variety of perspectives on common topics (like "work" in a sociology course), which themselves are often transformed by the inclusion of these perspectives. Thus, lectures in these phases explicitly represent partial truths, testable theories, or evidence examined from a variety of perspectives. The aim of discussions in these phases is also different from the types of discussion described as characteristic of phases one, two and three. Phase two "structured discussions" lead to explicit course generalizations and phase three "consciousness raising" discussions seek to elicit and reward students' personal experiences and also match them to course generalizations. Phase four and five discussions, however, seek to build generalizations inductively from the

particularity of student experiences, combined with and informed by other course materials. The concern is not only to match student experiences to course concepts as in phase three, but to use such contributions to build a more complex conceptualizaton of a given issue, one that both legitimizes individual voices and puts them in a larger explanatory context. Whereas in the previous phases of curriculum and scholarship, and in previous developmental stages, theories are viewed as given, in these later phases, theories are viewed as evolving. Thus, the pedagogy of phase four and five discussions involves students in a new way, both as knowers (and experts in their own reality), and as "co-investigators" in a common and on-going process of knowledge construction. Such discussions suggest that some theories, some truths, are broader or more legitimate than others, because they point toward further explanation and exploration. They are contextual, because in recognizing a multiplicity of perspectives, including the students' own, they seek to put them all in a larger and more inclusive context.

Students at different stages of cognitive development learn different things in the same course. If the teacher, however, models a contextual approach, then perhaps some students can move forward in their thinking: the dualists toward multiplism, the multiplists toward contextualism. In summary, in the design of this study we have first attempted to analyze our courses in terms of the phases of content and

pedagogy just described, and then to evaluate their impact on students in relation to their stage of cognitive development.

III. EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS AND PRACTICES

How did the two education courses in this study exemplify the content and pedagogy indicated above? First let us briefly describe the two institutional settings.

Wheaton is a liberal arts college concerned with equal career opportunities for women; it offers no professional training except in education, which can only be taken as a minor. In 1980 Wheaton received a three-year grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education (FIPSE) to include the new scholarship on women in introductory level courses such as the one described here. The vast majority of graduating seniors in 1983 reported a positive reaction to the inclusion of women in their courses, and a strong sense of female identity and purpose on the final questionnaire for the FIPSE project.

Simmons College prepares women for careers within the context of a liberal education. With the broadening of career areas for women in the last ten years, fewer students have chosen to enter traditional women's occupations like teaching. The concentrations of management, accounting,and communications now attract the majority of students. There is an active women's studies program at Simmons, but there

has not been an attempt to integrate the new scholarship on women throughout the curriculum. Women who choose to attend Simmons believe that their undergraduate education will prepare them for at least an entry level position in a career area.

"Schooling in America", taught at Wheaton, is a required introductory course on the history and foundations of American education, including units on educational philosophy, the founding and growth of the American public school system, and present-day issues such as multi-culturalism and equal educational opportunity. The Simmons course, "Schools in an Era of Change" examines today's classrooms as they serve a heterogeneous population of multi-racial, multi-cultural, and bilingual learners. Topics include mainstreaming, the impact of computer technology, and the school as a social organization. In the Wheaton course this year, the new scholarship on women led to the inclusion of material on the educational history of women, on women as teachers, and on sexism and gender stereotyping in contemporary classrooms. While "Schools in an Era of Change" did not explicitly focus on women's education in the same way, girls were seen to have different educational experience than boys. Both courses employed a similar pedagogy, linking course themes to students' own experience, and relying almost exclusively on a discussion format.

IV. RESEARCH DESIGN

This study is essentially two case studies of two separate courses which have been compared on certain dimensions. The methodology employed here attempts to reflect a complex and interactive, rather than a simple cause and effect relationship, among the three areas of course content, pedagogy, and the nature of student learning in these two classes. Instead of asking what was the effect on female students of teaching a certain course content through a certain pedagogy, we have asked how different students seem to have experienced particular class sessions (as well as the whole course) in relation to certain aspects of their own thinking. We have not assumed that student reactions and experiences could be placed on a single continuum or measured on pre- and post test scales, but rather we have been concerned to analyze these reactions in terms of the different students' particular stage of cognitive functioning, revealed through interviews in terms of their views of knowledge, of themselves, and of themselves as women, and as future teachers.

Thus we examined a three-way interaction, among course content, course pedagogy, and student cognitive level. These interactions obviously transpired over time. The cognitive level of each student, as measured in the fall, may have changed over the course of the semester, which perhaps further influenced the ways in which the course was

experienced. Before analyzing these interactions in depth, we first explain our techniques of analysis of each of these three major factors: content, pedagogy, and student cognitive stages. To describe the way in which the content of each course reflected the phases of women's scholarship, the syllabi and topics have been analyzed according to the phase theories of curriculum integration described above (Tetreault, 1982 and 1984 and McIntosh, 1984). To categorize the various pedagogical techniques and forms of discussion used in representative classes, we performed analyses of classroom interaction based on Maher's observation model (1981). We examined student writings and interview data for their descriptions of what transpired in specific classes and discussions. To locate student stages of cognitive functioning, we interviewed four students in each class, matched for age, college class, and previous background in education courses, using a schedule developed by the Women's Cognitive Development Project at Wellesley College (Clinchy et. al.) Part of this interview schedule was concerned with the studnts' views of knowledge; we used these responses to place each student in the appropriate cognitive stage. Another part explored the students' attitudes towards women and towards themselves as women. The final section explored the students' views on themselves, their work, and teaching as a career. Each student was interviewed in the fall and again in January, at the end of the course.

The material from these sixteen interviews was supplemented for the Wheaton students by other written data. All the Wheaton students wrote educational autobiographies, which were used as part of the content and pedagogy of the course, and which also revealed the different ways in which students experienced the themes of the course. By comparing the interview data from both colleges to the Wheaton interviewees' autobiographies,and thence to the other autobiographies written by Wheaton students, we could thus begin to describe, for example, a multiplist view of female roles. Both the Wheaton interviewees and the other Wheaton students also wrote journal reactions to specific classes and to the course as a whole. Similarly, the Simmons interviewees were asked in the second interviews about their reactions to their course and to specific aspects of it. Taken together, this data also enabled us to describe a multiplist and contextualist view of course content and pedagogy in each course.2

We now turn to our specific analysis of the courses and the students' experiences of them. First, we describe the different cognitive stages exemplified by the eight students at the beginning of the semester, as revealed by the intitial interview data. Second, we describe each course in turn, in terms of both content and pedagogy. We show how students experienced aspects of the course they took, and how they viewed the course as a whole, using the interviews and written data. We will also examine the final interviews

to determine any general shifts in development over the semester, and to compare the two courses in the two settings. The data from the study is summarized in a chart, included as Appendix B. Finally, in a conclusion, we attempt to define an appropriate content and methodology for the promotion of female student development, and suggest directions for further research.

V. DATA ANALYSIS

A. STUDENT COGNITIVE LEVEL: THE INITIAL INTERVIEW DATA

In both education courses, student enrollment ranged from freshmen to seniors. One of the background variables hypothesized to affect student experiences with these courses was student level of cognitive maturity. To measure this, and to estimate the relationships between student cognitive level and the impact of the course, four students in each class were interviewed at the beginning and end of the course. The initial interviews, based on a scale from the Women's Development Project, sought mainly to establish the students' view of knowledge, or cognitive level: dualist, multiplist, or contextualist. The final interviews were used to determine any changes during the semester, and to describe how each of these students experienced the

issues raised by the course- namely, self-concept, attitudes towards self as a woman, and career goals. By comparing the interview responses to the writings of the other students, we also hoped to account for some variations in the ways in which the students experienced the courses according to developmental stage.

As a result of the initial interviews, the four freshmen from both colleges were scored as early multiplists, the Wheaton sophomore and one Simmons junior as late multiplists, and the other juniors, one from each college, as contextualists. Judging from student writings, there were no dualists in either course, and the junior interviewees in each college seemed to be among the few contextualists. Most students were multiplists. These results were predictable from Clinchy and Zimmerman's research, which found a similar relationship between college class and stage of cognitive development. (See Clinchy and Zimmerman, 1982, p. 168.)

As initial indicators of cognitive stage, we examined the way in which students viewed knowledge, learning, and truth. To the question, "When experts disagree, how do you know who is right?", freshmen multiplists described how they knew whom or what to believe in the following way: Mary from Wheaton said, "(if experts disagree) I think anyone's opinion is as good as another's. I don't go too much for the expert scene, because everyone's entitled to their own view." Cathy said, "I don't think there is such a thing as

a wrong opinion, because everyone is entitled to what they think." And at Simmons, Linda said, "You listen to others' opinions. You have to hear everything. And then you pick and choose what to believe. And then what you believe is what's true." These students viewed knowledge as primarily dependent upon individual and personal choice.

The older students had a more differentiated view of knowledge. A Wheaton sophomore, Debbie, whom we scored as a late multiplist, was struggling with the need to integrate her views of herself and the world into a larger context. Although "everyone's opinion is as good as another's,... there are people's opinions that are hurtful and painful, and I don't think that's right... I don't think it's something that society needs." Another late multiplist, Susan from Simmons, struggled with defining her conception of knowledge and how one distinguishes truth from falsity: "I don't ever think there's one specific truth about everything- there's a lot of different truths... Everyone has the right to voice their opinion as long as they don't inflict it on others." Here also, the notion that some opinions might be less useful than others, might even be harmful, has arisen.

Whereas the late multiplists were still concerned with balancing different opinions, both contextualists have arrived at a new synthesis of personal inner knowledge and outside wider truth. Chris from Wheaton says, "I do think some opinions are wrong...I don't think it's a coincidence

tht we all agree that (killing babies) is wrong. It's hard to know what that is, where it comes from, whether it comes from our society, or our being women, or considering religious aspects." Laura, the junior contextualist from Simmons, described how she approached new material: "I sit down and I reason it all through, and I get the logic behind every step. Why is the author saying this? That's one thing I've also learned to do- to question things... In high school, it would never occur to me to say that an author or teacher was probably out in left field. I would have thought the problem was with me. And now I just study it 'till I have their logic down. I compare it to my logic, and by that point I've been thinking about it so much, it's embedded in my mind and combined wih my examples." She has learned to think through new ideas and integrate them into her existing thought structures.

The multiplists and contextualists also showed differences in the ways in which they articulated a general sense of self. The interview question asked, "How would you describe yourself to yourself?" The freshmen in both institutions were struggling with self-concepts revolving around a new sense of being independent and away from home. At Wheaton Mary observed: "I think the fact that I've left home (is important)...I have to make a new start by myself and make new decisions by myself on my own." Cathy replied, "Being independent is one of my main things...becoming a better person, better at running my own

life." Both Simmons freshmen said they picked Simmons to be close to home; each described phoning home several times a week. By contrast, the Wheaton sophomore, Debbie, a late multiplist, described her personal qualities and sense of self rather than her struggle to separate herself from home: "I am witty, intelligent, generous... right now, I have a lot of faults, but I've been feeling really good about myself...And as I work toward the goals, the process of working towards them will change me, but I don't know how." Chris, a contextualist, described both herself and her relatonships with others: "I think I was probably more self-centered before... I don't feel as self-critical... I find myself finding it easier to talk to others and make friends. I hope to have friendships on different levels, different bases (in the future)."

The way in which the multiplists saw themselves as women also differed from that of the contextualists. In the views of the freshman multiplists, the only difference between the sexes other than the obvious physical ones came from the OUTSIDE, from the external treatment of each sex. They did not see the complex interaction between societal categories and personal identity. At Wheaton, Cathy said, "I think being a woman, there are more obstacles in a sense, but we are all capable of doing the same things"; (and there are) "no innate differences." While Mary answered; "They don't give females enough of a chance, but... I can't think of any important differences (between men and women)." At

Simmons, Linda stated that, "We're treated differently than men. We still are. They say we aren't, but we still are." She also saw herself as being limited by gender and threatened by the women's movement: "I always thought it was unfair that I was a girl." These students were not yet able to locate aspects of themselves in the context of being women. As said above, their multiplist view of a self which is both unique and yet undefinable, prevented them from separating out any of their personal qualities as particularly female ones, or seeing the interaction between these personal qualities and outside treatment or expectatons based on gender roles.

The older students had more complex views of themselves as women. Debbie, the late multiplist from Wheaton, liked being a woman because, "I like the idea of being able to give birth...to nurture...I'm a nurturer." Chris, the contextualist from Wheaton, said, "I think I'm much more emotional than men I know. Sometimes I can express how I feel and they can't."

The juniors liked being women, being at a women's college and the women's movement. At Simmons, Susan, a late multiplist, said that "Being a woman has a lot of advantages; you can be soft and feminine, and you can really go get what you want in a way I don't think men can." She saw herself as different from a man, rather than simply being treated differently. Laura, a contextualist, saw herself as a woman struggling to integrate her desire to

work, to have a husband, and to have children. She said that her women's studies courses had taught her about "coming to grips with the feminist movement and learning what other people said it meant to be a woman; and then is it really possible for a woman to do these things?" She added, "I want to act like a woman who is a person and this (these courses) has really taught me to do it." Both Susan and Laura described themselves as complex growing individuals who were clear about their status as women. Susan was able to state her goals of working, wanting to marry and perhaps have a family; while Laura, in discussing the same goals, described some of the role conflicts inherent in these goals. In summary, unlike the freshmen early multiplists, these older students were able to see themselves specifically as women and to view female qualities as part of their personal identities.

In all the interviews, however, the students were clearly struggling with the difficulty of defining a self which had to include the fact that they were female. For males in our society, being masculine and being human are one and the same- masculinity defines the norms and the standards for psychic health, success, and power (Broverman and Broverman et. al.). For females, gender identity has to be consciously integrated with a sense of self, as the two are not automatically the same. On one level, this struggle appears as the one between marriage versus career; or as Laura asked, "Is it possible for a woman to do these

things?" On another, more psychic level, it appears as the need to validate, come to terms with, and avow personal qualities of caring and nurturing that are not celebrated by our society as human qualities, but are relegated to women and thus demeaned. "I want to act like a woman who is a person,", Laura said. The comparable sentence, "I want to act like a man who is a person," does not imply that it is the quality of masculinity which hinders the development of personhood. The importance of the content and pedagogy of courses including women, such as those described below, may be precisely in helping young women like Laura to uncover a voice and then validate this struggle, connecting the personal female voice to the social contexts which give gender identity a social meaning.

Thus these eight students began the two courses with striking differences in degrees of cognitive complexity, with different ways of viewing knowledge, themselves, and themselves as people and as women. The freshmen were still struggling with issues of independence and separation from families; while the juniors were considering their futures in the context of female identity, work, and relationships. The next section of this paper will describe the content and pedagogy of each course and relate these to the students' experiences with the courses.

B. WHEATON: "SCHOOLING IN AMERICA"

"Schooling in America" ("Schooling") is an introductory level course required of all minors in education at Wheaton College, and taken by many who are considering teaching as a career. Last fall there were 25 women in the class: one senior, two juniors, twelve sophomores, and eleven freshmen. (This age distribution may explain why most students seemed to be multiplists.) After analyzing the content and pedagogy of sections of the course, we will describe student reactions to these sections, and their experience of the course as a whole, in terms of their cognitive stage.

1. COURSE CONTENT AND WOMEN'S EXPERIENCE

The course was roughly divided into three parts: an introductory section that presented various philosophies of education from Plato to Dewey; a section on the history of American education; and finally several sections on contemporary educational issues.

How were women included in this syllabus, according to Tetreault's phases? First, western philosophers' treatment of women as deviant was noted, but not explored. The students were given excerpts from Plato's REPUBLIC, as well as materials by Locke and Rousseau. The first section of the course, according to Tetrault's method of curiculum analysis, is phase two since the students did not read Plato on the potential ability of women to be guardians, nor explore the limited nature of Locke's and Rousseau's views on women's education. In the history section, the

development of American schools was described as affecting different groups in a variety of ways. Divisions of gender, race, class and culture were all found to have important and interrelated effects on peoples' experience of and ability to draw benefits from their education. This part of the course, then, seemed to be at phase four. The next related content area was a unit on equal educational opportunity, which had a section on sexist practices in schools, including curricula, teacher attitudes, and staffing practices. This unit seems to have been phase three, because the focus of most of the current research is on girls-as-a-group versus boys-as-a-group. Neither the readings nor the discussions paid any attention to VARIETIES of female or male experiences in schools, as they had done in examining the history.

2. PEDAGOGY

On the basis of curriculum integration theory, the content of "Schooling" ranged from phase two to phase four (with some topics, like that on school finance, not dealing with gender at all). The two distinctive pedagogical features of the course were the use of students' experiences in relation to course themes and the reliance on discussion formats throughout. Student experiences were tapped, most importantly, through an educational autobiography, whose

entries were then discussed in class. The goals of the autobiography were threefold: first, to help students see themselves as examples of course themes; secondly, in so doing to help them define a personal perspective on course issues; and thirdly, to use that perspective in relation to other perspectives, so that they would become aware of the relation of their own stories to those of others, and to a wider context. Thus, during the unit on Plato, they wrote about a personal "enlightenment." During the unit on sexism in schools, they wrote on the relation of schooling and gender for themselves: "In what way has it made a difference in your education that you are a girl?" During the history unit, they researched and wrote an educational family tree. These last two entries, and the way they were handled in discussions, provide examples of the phase three and phase four pedagogical approaches suggested earlier.

The unit on sexism in schools was an example of a phase three approach, in that students compared their own experiences to those of all women as a group. Discussions were taped on two successive days. The tapes were analyzed according to the Maher model of classroom interaction, which distinguishes among three forms of interchange: labeling, wherein students are asked to memorize an unfamiliar concept using unfamiliar terms; definitional, wherein aspects of a topic are defined in terms which are already familiar to the students; and inductive, wherein familiar terms or concepts are used to test hypotheses and construct new

generalizations (see Maher, 1981). These two discussions were definitional in nature; the teacher presented, with numerous examples, gender variations in teacher treatment, curriculum, and staffing patterns. Students were encouraged to come up with examples from their own experience, which many did.

Journal reactions to these discussions had comments like this: "During my observation of elementary school and even nursery school classrooms, I was disturbed to find instances of these stereotypes running rampant." But also, from a minority viewpoint: "AREN'T THERE ANY OTHER ISSUES? I find it difficult to be pleased with a course/school which continually makes me feel hostile, oppressed, inferior... A college professor's experience in school and life is undoubtedly different from ours." This comment, a typically multiplist one, neatly separates her personal truth from the teacher's, also viewed by the student as being merely personal.

The next autobiography assignment asked the students to write about the role of gender in their own schooling, and thus to decide whether the generalizations were "true" or "not true" about themselves. In fact, twenty out of twenty-five entries reported instances of gender discrimination, special treatment, and different rewards for different behavior. A few wrote, however, vehemently denying sexism, and reflecting the hostility generated by the class discussion. "As I have sat in class, some of my

responses have been... anger at some of the narrowmindedness of the topics. I never felt cheated as a little girl in a dress as opposed to a little boy in pants." However, later on this student reacted to the namecalling of girls playing male sports as "freaks": "they forgot their gender and remembered who they were." In this paper, a student who wanted simply to be treated as an individual was resisting the gender stereotypes imposed by the previous discussion on sexism.

We have classified the structure of these two discussions and writings on sexism in schooling as phase three for several reasons. While these discussions encouraged the students to think of their schooling in relation to their personal experience of gender roles, the students were limited by both the form and the content of the presentation. First, content generalizations were made about all females as a group in the school setting; varieties of female experience were not explored. Secondly, in terms of form, the teacher did not ask the students to describe their own experiences first, and then use these experiences, along with research data and reading, to build generalizations about the role of gender discrimination in school life. Had she done so, each student's personal story would have become part of a wider framework, which might have taken into account and begun to explain the varieties of female experiences presented by the students. As it was, since generalizations came first and were applied to all

women, the responses quoted above, dismissing the generalizations, were possible: "A college professor's experience is different from ours." Because the discussion did not begin with students' own experiences in relation to each other and to other materials, a multiplist response was encouraged- the teacher has her truth and I have mine.

Thus, discussions about "all women", presented as organizing generalizations to which student experience must be compared, are not only multiplist discussions, but encourage a multiplist response. By contrast, however, the use of the educational family tree during the history unit provided the basis for a discussion which was phase four in content, and inductive, or contextualist, in form.

After reading historical accounts of different ethnic groups, racial groups and women, the students were divided into small groups to explain their own family stories. The ensuing discussion showed a range of educational backgrounds, from the Portuguese immigrants with a first granddaughter in college, to a Yankee family who started at the top and stayed there. From this discussion, certain themes emerged: the generally lower educational level of the women, the ambition expressed through education, and the relation of family values to mobility. Because generalizations were built inductively from particular student perspectives, and were based on varieties of female (and male) experience organized by class and ethnicity as well as gender, these interactions could be classified as

phase four. Student journal reactions to the discussion tended to focus on the ways in which their families were typical: "My family's educational history fits in a lot to what we have studied... I have gotten a lot out of everyone else's experiences and also through their educational history." Completely absent from these journal entries was any of the hostility encountered above, perhaps because there were several bases for comparison around which the gender comparisons could be organized.

Thus, the pedagogy of the "Schooling" class used student experiences, particularly the autobiographies, in various ways. Students seemed more comfortable, and perhaps learned more about themselves, in phase four discussions such as the one on family history, than in phase three discussions like the one on sexism in schools.

C. THE STUDENTS' EXPERIENCE OF "SCHOOLING" BY COGNITIVE STAGE

1. SPECIFIC CLASSES

The two types of discussions described above seemed to produce slightly different responses in students depending upon their degree of cognitive maturity. The reaction quoted above: "A college professor's experience in school and life is undoubtedly different from ours," not only

reflects hostility toward the "bad news" of sexism in education, but also a typically multiplist response to the generalizations made in that class. Because they did not fit with her own experience, her "gut", she could reject them as only the professor's experience and the professor's personal "truth." If the generalizations "fit", as they did for other multiplists, then they were accepted as making her own experience "typical." The discussion of the family tree, however, enabled multiplist students to validate more than one aspect of their own experience (gender governing only one feature of their family's history). Again, though, the multiplist concerns were with the degree to which they personally "fit in" or were typical.

In contrast to the multiplist concern with personal validation, the contextualist response to both classes was one of personal location within the context of the material, and an evaluation of the issues from that stance. In terms of the discussion on sexism in schools, Debbie writes, "Until I came to Wheaton, I was not aware that being female has influenced my educational career...I think this fear of showing one's smarts is shared by many women... We wanted to see who could please the teacher the most... (a) particularly feminine trait." Chris writes, "I arrive at two different interactions between schooling and gender. I have been socialized by the "place" of most of my female teachers into a passive and dependent role. However, in the academic realm, gender was usually forgotten." Both of

these women use the topic of sexism in schools to speculate not only on its specific effect on their experience, but also on what this experience could tell them about the interaction between outside expectations and the formation of their own perspective.

The contextualist response to the family tree discussion also differed from that of the multiplists. Moving beyond the concern with being "typical" or not, Christine said the discussion made her "aware of a difference in my education because I was not either in the lower class or the upper middle class." Another student, the only senior in the class, wrote, "Had I not gone to a college-bound school, I would not, most likely, be at Wheaton. (Yet) the fact that I did go to college is representative of the American educational system." (She is the first in her family to do so.) Both these responses reflect the contextualist concern with personal location within a larger framework.

In comparing the multiplist and contextualist responses to these two classes, we can see the phase four, family tree discussion allowed a different interaction with the issues than the discussion on sexism in schools. In the sexism discussion, generalizations were made about the school experiences of women as a group, and the discussion proceeded in terms of providing definitions and examples of these generalizations. Not only were variations of female experience ignored, but similarities between male and female

experiences, for example of the same social class as compared to other social classes, were also ignored. While validating some multiplist students' experiences, the discussion thus alienated others, who could simply say, "that's not true about me." Only the few contextualists in the class could interpret the gender issues into a wider context, and understand how gender had specifically affected them in some ways and not others.

The family tree discussion was inductive, not definitional. The context itself and the generalizations arrived at were created from the student stories. Thus multiplists had to look at different ways of seeing their own stories in comparison to others (in terms of class or culture as well as gender), and perhaps in this sense were able to move towards a more contextual view of themselves. They could not rest with either an acceptance or rejection of a set of dominant generalizations based on only one category, but could see that category- gender- as having variations of its own.

Thus while these phase three discussions validated personal experiences, they also left these experiences at the multiplist level of different truths for different people, with some experiences, the "typical ones" simply being more numerically common than others (not more representative of any wider reality). Phase four inductive discussions, on the other hand, may help both multiplists and contextualists move closer to both a more personally

located and yet more inclusive view of knowledge, in which different perspectives are related and compared to gain a wider, shared truth. We now turn to the students' experience of the course as a whole, as evidenced in final course writings and interviews. What did students at each cognitive stage take away from "Schooling in America?"

2. THE COURSE AS A WHOLE: FINAL COURSE WRITINGS AND INTERVIEWS

Final written assignments were analyzed for students' attitudes towards women and towards themselves. The "summary" educational autobiography assignment asked the students to discuss the autobiographies and the course as a whole. In terms of women's roles, most entries seemed to reflect a multiplist view, and repeated earlier themes of discrimination coupled with an assessment of whether or not their experience had been typical: "In relation to gender and schooling my education has been somewhat typical and somewhat atypical. I never noticed a difference (in academics), but a difference was obvious in most extracurricular activities." Another student: "Unlike the young women I have heard speak in class, I have been taught to be independent as well as disciplined along with the boys." Overall, these summaries reflected the multiplist attitude towards femininity noted in the initial interviews,

namely that most aspects of gender experience came from outside. Most of these students experienced their femininity as a category of treatment, determining aspects of their personal experience which they could see as more or less typical, rather than as an integral aspect of their personal identity.

As indicated above, it is a characteristic of multiplist responses not to be able to see specific aspects of oneself as related to wider role expectations. The few contextualist students, however, could integrate their educational experiences with gender issues into a sense of how they saw themselves as students and as people. A sophomore, Debbie, says, "it has only been recently that I have become aware of the ways that being female has affected me...looking back I have realized that I was a passive learner, which is typical of many women." This entry brings together consciousness of gender with an overall self-awareness, an integration that is missing in most entries.

Secondly, beyond issues of gender, how did the students see themselves as they summarized their experiences of the educational autobiography and the "Schooling" class? Almost all the summaries emphasized the importance of education in "making me who I am today," a multiplist response. However, these students tended to describe themselves as independent and unique (although in no specifically described ways), even while they were listing all the features of school that

were making them conform. Thus, one student wrote, "I strongly believe that one is a direct product of one's environment, especially in terms of social and intellectual ideals", but later responded, "the educational experience is an individual process which yields completely unique results for every person...It is the individual who must take advantage of all that is offered him."

Thus, the majority of students tended to discuss ways in which their own education was like that described in the course and then go on to describe themselves as unique-- but in very general, even abstracted and masculine, terms. Like gender, education is perceived as an outside category of treatment, not as a set of experiences related to specific aspects of personal development or growth. Again however, the contextualist responses were different. Debbie said, "I first have to describe who I am- a 20 year old college student that has finally decided what she wants out of life." Chris replied: "the overall effect of my educaton has been to produce an intelligent female who is trying to balance all areas of learning." These entries revealed an integration of education and selfhood missing from most of the others, and came mostly from the older students. No freshmen had any descriptive statements about themselves in their summaries.

What did students' experiences of the "Schooling" course have to do with these self-concept issues? The multiplist summaries credited the course with helping them

notice features of their more-or-less typical educational experiences: "The course has helped me see how important education has been to me and how it has helped me become the person that I am." Again, however, the specific personal qualities of this "person" are not described. For some, the course's exposure to the educational system was personally threatening, particularly, as we have seen, around gender issues. "I was being bombarded with the shortcomings of American education in class, and suddenly the entries became increasingly threatening as well. I had to talk about my family's education and prove whether or not what I'd heard in class was accurate..." She resolves this neatly: "But I am different..., ...I am unique, like so many people are."

Overall, the multiplist students seemed to see the course, and the autobiography, as giving a structure or set of themes to which they could compare themselves. All saw their own education as in some way reflective of larger societal themes, but as we have seen, very few- the contextualists- viewed their educational experience as a consciously analyzed part of their personal identity. For the multiplists, their own selves, although experienced as unique, provided the only touchstone for assessing the general "accuracy" of the course. However, through the discussions of women's experience and autobiography, the course did validate their expression of personal truth. For the contextualists, the course went further, giving them some means for discovering, defining, and comparing aspects

of a personally located perspective on the world.

C. SIMMONS: SCHOOLS IN AN ERA OF CHANGE

At Simmons, Edu 156, "Schools in an Era of Change" is one of three required education courses which students choose as an introduction to the field and to test their decision to teach. Last fall twenty students were enrolled, almost equally divided among freshmen, sophmores, and juniors with one senior.

1. COURSE CONTENT AND WOMEN'S EXPERIENCE

"Schools in an Era of Change" examined such topics as mainstreaming, the impact of computer technology, and the school as a social organization. The course especially asked students to consider the role of schools as an agent of change versus an agent of conservation.

In terms of Tetreault's and McIntosh's phases, Edu. 156 did not explicitly include women as part of its curriculum. However, in the sections on testing and computers, there was discussion of the differential treatment of boys and girls in schools. In the section on the use of standardized achievement and I.Q tests, students discussed test items which might be sexist or racist. The initial introduction

to the computer, its first use for eleven members of the class, provoked a discussion on math and computer phobia and the way in which many of them had been treated in math classes in their prior schooling. Students then began to identify which software would appeal more to boys because of themes like battles or machines. The questions raised about differential gender treatment, or bias in standardized tests or computer software, were those reflective of a phase three approach to curriculum. The discussions did not extend to phase four, which might have considered these issues in a broader context of the society, socialization, or schooling in general.

2. PEDAGOGY

"Schools in an Era of Change" was taught by two instructors, both of whom participated in all class discussions, and each having clear responsibility for certain topics. The teaching methods were chosen to promote active student participation in their own learning, and to combine theoretical content with assignments in schools so that students could experientially evaluate the validity of the course content.

Thus, each student was assigned to be a teacher's aide one morning a week, as well as to interview appropriate school personnel to learn how that school dealt with issues or problems raised by the course, such as computers, standardized testing, or mainstreaming. Twice during the

semester students had to complete a fieldwork questionnaire in which they explicitly related the course themes to their fieldwork. In those schools where there were computers, several students wrote comments like,"Only the boys choose to go to the computer during free time." or "The teacher uses the computer to bribe the noisy or active children, who are almost always boys, to behave." However, these reactions were written and not brought up in the class discussions of sexism and computer use. Thus these student experiences were not validated through group discussion in the same way as the earlier discussions on testing or computer software had done.

In the co-author's sections of the course, the dominant pedagogy was discussion and experiential learning (using case studies, small group experiences, etc.). The other instructor combined lecture and structured discussion. In terms of the Maher observation model, most classes were definitional in nature. For example, when the other instructor presented terms related to standardized testing, students were able to make these definitions their own by finding and explaining illustrations from the tests. There were also examples of inductive or phase four classes (as measured by the Maher model). In a discussion on the purpose of schooling, students brainstormed all the possible reasons for education. From their list of about thirty items, students were able to create broader categories such as skills for survival, cultural heritage, or personal

development. By the end of the class, the students had built generalizations on the purpose of schooling to which many of them referred during the semester. The instructors had different pedagogical styles which were noted, often critically, by students in their course evaluations, with freshmen being the most uncomfortable with the differences in pedagogy. The differences in cognitive level between the freshmen and juniors described below may partially explain these student reactions.

D. STUDENTS' EXPERIENCE IN "SCHOOLS IN AN ERA OF CHANGE"

This section will examine the interview data and final course writings, particularly focusing on the role of fieldwork in influencing career choice, the students' sense of themselves as women, and their self concept.

1. FIELDWORK AND CAREER CHOICE

The two freshmen interviewees, Jen and Linda, reacted in a personal way to their fieldwork. Each began the semester unsure of whether she wanted to teach. Although one of these multiplists had a good field experience and the other did not, each talked about how this experience made her feel: "I really do have a rapport with kids and it makes me feel wonderful; "The kids were fantastic. I loved the kids." These two experienced the fieldwork through the strongly positive reaction of the children to them as

classroom aides. Their different reaction to their cooperating teachers appeared to affect their degree of committment to teaching as a career choice. Jen sharply criticized her cooperating teacher and remained at the end of the semester unsure of whether to continue in teaching or move into psychology as a major. She described her pull toward teaching in personal terms by referring to the children and to her grandmother's wish that she teach. Linda's experience confirmed her decision to teach, but also made her unsure of whether to teach English in high school or to be an elementary school teacher. The reaction of the children were clearly a significant pull to the elementary level despite her interest in writing, drama, and literature. Thus the fieldwork validated and helped to define aspects of themselves for these freshmen. However, they did not relate these personal truths to any perceptions of the general context of teaching-for instance, the common female motive to work in a nurturing role.

For the juniors, a late multiplist and a contextualist, the fieldwork confirmed their choice of teaching as a career. They described their decision with greater complexity than the freshmen. Laura, the contextualist, recognized the issue of choosing a stereotypical women's career, "I was kind of scared (about my choice) because I thought I would feel guilty about being an education major, because, God, look at everything that's been done. I could go be a doctor, and here I want to be an education major.

Teaching is just hopping right into the stereotype." Through her course experience, she was able to articulate some ways in which the profession is commonly viewed, but was also able to affirm why she had made her own choice.

2. WOMEN'S ROLES

In the interviews at the end of the semester, each of the four also revealed an increasing sophistication in her conception of women's roles. In response to the question, "What does being a woman mean to you?", one freshman multiplist responded: (October) "I realize I can get away with certain things that men can't. At my job there's a man and we work ringing up at a register, and I got special treatment over him."; (January) "Well, I've got opportunities out there. You have to accept yourself as a woman and see what real blocks you have to overcome. And once you overcome those, anything you want you can grasp." This freshman has moved from seeing herself as specially privileged to realizing that although she had many opportunities, she would have to recognize the roadblocks in order to realize them. Both freshmen still defined women as being different from men due to roles and socialization, and they tended to view these differences negatively. "When you're told that you have to go out and earn a living, your whole life seems to be centered around it. Whereas women get a chance to be people before they have to be career oriented. Men don't seem to get a chance to be human." This freshman multiplist who had in the first interview

described feelings of wishing to be a man, continued the above comment by saying, "It's kind of sad; I'm glad I'm not a man." Like the Wheaton multiplist students, they can assess some component of gender sterotyping, but cannot relate them to specific qualities in themselves.

One of the juniors, a late contextualist, responded to the same question in September by saying,"I like the women's movement: .the liberation and everything, they're naturally important to me, and being a woman has a lot of advantages." At the end of the semester, shesaid, "I'm glad I'm a woman-I wouldn't want to be a man. Women, even though they've been oppressed for I don't know how long, are open to more than men because a woman is a more dimensional person than a man is. I think a woman can feel more, and yet accomplish at the same time." In the final interview, this junior is more able to articulate why she is glad to be a woman, and describes specific female qualites (although she stopped short of applying those qualities to herself.)

3. OVERALL SELF-CONCEPT

The major indicators of student self-concept were also the four interviews. In each case, students saw themselves in a broader framework, more differentiated from their parents, and with clearer career goals at the end of the semester.

In response to the interview question,"How would you describe yourself to yourself?", the freshman called Linda

described herself in September as being frightened about going to college, calling her parents daily, but realizing "that I can't be dependent any more." By January she answered, "I don't know if my sense of myself as a woman has changed, but just my sense of self has changed. I like myself better now than earlier. I'm glad I finally got up the guts to leave the house." At the end of the semester, this freshman is beginning to be comfortable in breaking away from home and seeing herself as an individual. In response to the same question, Susan, a junior, responded in September; "I think I would try to avoid that... I guess, sort of lazy sometimes; I really have to push myself. I think I'm well-intentioned, but sometimes I just get carried away with other things."; and in December: "A little lazy sometimes. I think I'm a nice person; I'm considerate of others. I'm a little bit more sure of myself because my future is sort of planned out for me. I have a direction. I'm probably a little bit more open to things and don't judge people as harshly." In January she still describes the same fault, but she adds positive qualities and a new sense of direction.

Although it is not possible to say whether the development of their sense of self was due to the course or their whole semester's experience, all interviewees commented that the course provided them with a clearer commitment to their career. However, perhaps because the Simmons course did not often explictly include gender as a

category of analysis, the Simmons interviewees, both freshmen and juniors, did not discuss themselves as women in as much detail as did the Wheaton students. The integration of gender and self was not seen as such a central issue, either in the course or in the interview responses.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The final part of this study was to compare the results found in the two classes. We had comparable data in the form of responses in the interviews conducted with the four students from each college. Were there any salient differences in the two institutional contexts, or in student cognitive level that these contexts could explain? As described above, a major institutional difference was Wheaton's effort to integrate women's scholarship in all areas of the curriculum, which may have made these students particularly sensitive to gender issues.

In terms of specific course content and pedagogy, the major difference between the two courses in the study lay in the explicit inclusion of women's topics in "Schooling in America." As discussed above, "Schooling" included the female experience in major units, while the Simmons course looked at the issue of sexism primarily in the more limited context of testing and computers. However, from a comparison of the interview data, we concluded that the

students of the same age and cognitive stage showed striking similarities which far outweighed any differences by college or course.

The two juniors at Simmons, like the junior and sophomore at Wheaton, were late multiplists and early contextualists; while all the freshmen were multiplists. The ways in which these students experienced the courses were strikingly similar by cognitive level. In both courses, the freshmen experienced discussion and multiple viewpoints as an expression of each student's unique personal reality. In both courses, however, the older interviewees had different experiences of the courses than the younger ones, and were more similar to each other than to their younger counterparts. Both the older students at Wheaton and the juniors at Simmons were able to use the courses in describing themselves and their personal futures as evolving and changing in a wider context.

The most striking conclusion of this study, then, seems to lie in the relationships between student levels of cognition, as exemplified by the interview data, the educational autobiographies from the Wheaton course, and the written record of students' experiences in the different courses. In both courses the curriculum explicitly included student experiences, through the autobiography in "Schooling" and the fieldwork assignments in "Schools." Both courses also were taught in discussion formats.

The educational autobiographies and journals kept in

the Wheaton class reflected the same variations by cognitive stage that the interviews of the eight students revealed. For example, in an interview a freshman multiplist said, "they don't give females enough of a chance, but I can't think of any important differences between men and women." Similarly, most gender entries in the autobiographies described gender as a category of treatment coming from outside, rather than as an integral part of a personal identity. However, the contextualist respondents as noted above, began to make those connections between outside context and personal attributes. A contextualist interviewee said, "I have white middle class attitudes"; and a contextualist autobiography gives us, "it has only been recently that I have become aware of the way being female has affected me." Thus, by analyzing both interviews and autobiographical responses by cognitive level, we can draw some final conclusions about the interactions among context, pedagogy and cognition suggested at the beginning of this paper.

The fieldwork assignments in the Simmons class, as described in the interviews, and the student writings in the Wheaton class, for example, both showed the effects of experiential discussions in different curricular phases on different levels of cognition. In the Wheaton class, in phase three discussions like that on sexism in the schools, multiplists decided whether or not they were "typical" and accepted or rejected the generalizations presented to them:

"In relation to gender and schooling my education has been somewhat typical and somewhat atypical." Contextualist students may have used such discussions to locate themselves in regard to the stereotypes, but in phase three discussions the emphasis on only women as a group also limited contextualists to a consideration of whether or not they were "typical."

Phase four discussions, on the other hand, like that of the family tree in the "Schooling" class, permitted all the students to reach for a more contextual view. They could locate themselves by more than one dimension, by class and culture as well as gender, and thus come to see their own perspective as limited but valid, one among many. The inductive nature of this particular discussion encouraged such a contextual approach. Moreover, phase four discussions perhaps brought the multiplist students along, by forcing them to compare themselves, not to a generalized stereotype (as in phase three), but to specific other experiences. Thus a multiplist entry said, "I have gotten a lot out of everyone else's educational history. It's really interesting to find out about the different backgrounds." And a contextualist, moving further, was able to say, "I was a passive learner, but almost any female of my upbringing and background could share the same experience." In the Simmons class, the fieldwork component, also experiential, enabled the multiplists to experience and express personal feelings about teaching, and helped a contextualist to

decide on teaching as a career in spite of its stereotypic association with certain female roles. Therefore, these interactive, experiential, and inductive pedagogical strategies seem fruitful tools in assisting students' development toward contextualism.

However, the main difference between the two courses, namely the explicit inclusion of material on women's experience in the Wheaton "Schooling in America" course, may account for a few variations in student reactions between the two colleges. Laura's struggle with her female identity came, she said, from her women's studies courses (see above, p.21). And had this particular Simmons course explicitly included material on the sexism in our schools and in the educational histories of female pupils and women teachers, perhaps Laura would not have felt so guilty about, or limited by, her choice of teaching as a career. In short, she might have been able to better analyze the integration of societal structures and personal choice implied by becoming "a woman who is a teacher." Furthermore, had the fieldwork experiences been discussed as explicitly relevant to the gender roles played by teachers and pupils, perhaps the students would have explored further the relat on of their own personal qualities, such as loving children, to the demands of teaching as a career.

This analysis of student responses to these two courses suggests that female students may benefit, cognitively and personally, from courses that both include women's

experiences as part of course content AND provide ways of relating students' personal lives, histories and experiences to the themes of the course. Instead of learning knowledge which is exterior and apart, they are learning material which their own experience helps them both to explain and evaluate. This personal making of meaning within a larger context is encouraged in courses where content and pedagogy come together, where the content reflects aspects of women's reality, and where the pedagogy is inductive, interactive, and draws on students' experiences of the world as women. If students are women, after all, much of their experience will only be legitimized in courses which include material from a female perspective. However, course content, to be truly reflective of human experience, cannot simply reflect "women's reality" per se. Courses either ignorant of OR dichotomized by gender are limiting both in terms of content or pedagogy. In courses ignoring gender, where gender is a relevant theme, female students are ignored or demeaned, since "neutral" courses are in fact masculine ones. Because gender was not a central issue in the Simmons course, the student choosing teachig was not helped to analyze the context which makes teaching both female AND demeaning. In courses (or units) dichotomized by gender, however, only one aspect of personal experience is validated (albeit a primary one). The VARIETIES of female (and male) experience remain uncovered in course content, and therefore not validated in student lives.

The main reason then, why phase four discussions and a phase four (or five) curriculum may promote cognitive development toward contextualism is that the variety of human experience is allowed fuller play, and in fact becomes the basis for inductive learning and theory building in the classroom. Phase three content and phase three multiplist discussions, while validating female students' experience and voice as females, nevertheless obscures not only the variety of female experience, but also other comparisons such as those among women and men of the same class or race. Furthermore, inductive discussions (a phase four pedagogy) which are based on student experiences but which ignore those aspects of those experiences which may depend on gender, limit female students' ability to locate themselves in that context, or validate themselves as particularly female humans. (Not all topics for discussion necessarily relate to gender, but many do that are often not currently discussed in terms of gender, such as the purpose of schooling.)

We are suggesting, therefore, that curriculum at phase four, taught inductively, is the framework most appropriate for the promotion and expression of female cognitive development in college. Both multiplist and contextualist female students can use such a pedagogy to develop themselves as women who are knowers and makers of meaning. Obviously, more research (and curriculum change) is needed. Male students, too, could benefit from phase four and phase

five curricula and pedagogy, in which varieties of human experience are explored and within which THEIR gender becomes visible as a category and discussed. The relationship between gender, age, class and cognitive development also needs further exploration. How do high school students of both sexes experience their education, their sense of self and gender, and their lives? Can we assume that they, or older people who never went to college, remain dualists? Finally, the link described here between cognitive development, course content and course pedagogy needs further examination and explication. How is the intellectual development of female students enhanced by women's studies material which is taught mainly in a lecture format? What are some variations of the relation between phase four course content and phase four pedagogy? In the further development of our teaching and scholarship in women's studies, we must finally remember that it is for our female students' sense of knowledge and purpose that we labor as well as for our own. As William Perry once said, "It is the meanings they make of our meanings that matter."

END NOTES

1. Work in phase theories has been carried on by both Mary Kay Tetreault of Lewis and Clark College, and Peggy McIntosh of Wellesley. When referring to the phases, we cite both authors, in the use of specific quotations, we cite only the author quoted.

2. In the original design of this study, we sought to analyze changes in student attitudes towards women and female roles by administering the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence and Helmreigh, 1973) as a pre- and post-test to each class. This scale has been described by Porter and Eileenchild (1980) as one of the few instruments to pick up sex role attitude changes as a result of women's studies courses. In fact, in both classes the students had a very high mean score to begin with (85.8 out of a possible 100 points at Wheaton and 84.35 at Simmons), which may have had something to do both with the dated nature of the instrument itself and the feminine perspective of the students. The average score rose one point in each class on the post-test (to 86.8 at Wheaton and 85.21 at Simmons). It seems that the Attitude Toward Women Scale, however, cannot really tell us very much about students' self-concept as women. As Porter and Eileenchild themselves noted, introductory observational case studies, such as this one, which look in detail at classroom interactions, may be more informative than experimental studies which are overly focused on numerical indices of attitude change.

Kathleen Dunn, Simmons College

INTEGRATION OF CONTENT AND PEDAGOGY WITH STUDENT REACTION

CURRICULAR PHASE	PEDAGOGICAL METHOD
Phase I Male Scholarship The absence of women and other oppressed peoples from the content. Universal generalizations derived from male experience. Knowledge is the property of experts. Disciplines are Hierarchically organized.	Lecture The instructor presents the material which the students are to learn, as the truth of that subject matter. Structured Discussion Explication of discussion of themes of lecture, leading to instructor's concept of the problem.
Phase II Compensatory Scholarship "Add women and stir." Great women and description of traditional female behavior are added to the content. Female examples are usually chosen to reflect dominant generalizations of the discipline.	Lecture The addition of token women adds female examples to bolster dominant generalizations. Structured Discussion Explication or discussion of themes of lecture, leading to instructor's conceptualization of the problem.
Phase III Bi-focal Scholarship Women seen as a group rather than individuals meeting male norms. Women's experiences different from men's and equally valid. Focus on differences. Separate theories of women's experience are created.	Lecture Presents alternative frameworks for women's experiences and compares them to male models. "Two truths" Structured Discussion Consciousness Raising: Students encouraged to relate personal experiences to course generalizations.
Phase IV Feminist Scholarship Pluralistic concept of women shaped by race, class, culture, experience from personal and specific to general context. Phase V Multi-Focal Relational Scholarship Integration of the varieties of experience. Views women's experience in the context of race, class, etc., but also fuses women and men into holistic multidisciplinary view.	Phase IV & V Lecture Material is presented as partial truth or testable theory, or evidence examined from a variety of perspectives. Inductive Discussion Purpose to construct generalizations from varied perspectives including students' own. Students and instructor work together toward the construction of knowledge.

June, 1984

Not to be reproduced without permission of the authors.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COGNITIVE STATE	HYPOTHETICAL STUDENT REACTION ACCORDING TO STAGE
Dualism The authorities know the truth. My task is to find the right answer, and memorize it.	Dualist Reaction to lectures & discussions "This lecture is confusing." "Which historian has the right account of the causes of the civil war?" "The discussion is a waste of time." Why doesn't he give us the right answers?" Multiplist "There are a lot of accounts of the causes. The teacher has his opinion and I have mine." "A good discussion on Jane Addams today, but I could never be like her." Contextualist "How do these views fit in with or challenge what I know?" "The teacher is giving us his perspective, which I will use to help construct my own."
Multiplism In many areas there are no answers or truth. Opinions are subjective and come from one's own experience. It is hard to judge or act because there are no objective criteria. Diversity of opinion intrinsic.	Dualist Reaction to Consciousness Raising "There are some right answers for women and some for men; I can recognize myself sometimes." Multiplist "The lectures and discussions have shown me I am a typical (woman) in some ways and not-in others." Contextualist "I see that my being a woman has contributed to my own perspective."
Limited Contextualism Realizes that some arguments, examples, are better than others. Begins to recognize the structure of a discipline, its internal methodology and criteria. Agency genuine, intellectual, but limited to academic domain. Contextualism Recognizes the diversity of information, opinions, methodology and theories. Examines the context in order to chose the approach or theory to explain the data. Truth is partial, evolving and dependent on context. Reasoning and choice and construction of alternatives in all areas of life	Reaction to Inductive Discussions Dualist "There are lots of opinions, but the teacher gave us the answer after listening to all our ideas." Multiplist "There are many experiences to compare to mine. I guess I am typical of some kinds of women but not others." Contextualist "It helps to see my perspective in conjuction with those of others. I'm learning to see other views and take them into account."

Frances Maher, Wheaton College
Kathleen Dunn, Simmons College

APPENDIX B: The Wheaton Course

CURRICULAR PHASE	PEDAGOGICAL METHOD	MULTIPLIST	CONTEXTUALIST
1. Sexism in Schools- Phase 3- Women as a Group	Multiplist discussions- personal experience related to course themes	"College Professor's experience different from mine" or "mine was typical"	"I learned how being female has influenced my education."
2. Family Tree- Phase 4- Varieties of female and male experience	Contextual, inductive, discussions- building generalizations from different stories	"My family's history fits in..."	"Had I not gone to a middle class school, I wouldn't be at Wheaton."
3. Course as a Whole	Phases 3, 4, and 2 at some points	"My education was somewhat typical and somewhat not" "I am a product of my education, but also unique" Interviewees This course had "different points of view" People had "said what they think" "I am unique, like so many people are."	"I am a passive learner, typical of many women." "Effect of my education: to produce an intelligent female, balancing all areas of learning." Interviewees "My education was typical of a white middle class woman." "I am biased- I have white middle class attitudes."

Not to be reproduced without permission of the authors.

Frances Maher, Wheaton College
Kathleen Dunn, Simmons College

APPENDIX B: The Simmons Course

CURRICULAR PHASE	PEDAGOGICAL METHOD	MULTIPLIST	CONTEXTUALIST
1. Computers- sexist features of computer software Phase 3- Women as a group	Multiplist discussions- personal reactions to software used	"Only the boys choose to go to the computer during free time." (Written in the fieldwork evaluation, but not connected to discussion on software.)	
2. Purpose of schooling- students created broad categories for the purposes of education into which they placed their own goals & reasons for teaching (Phase 4)	Inductive discussion begun with brainstorming reasons for education, built to general goals	"How do I choose which goals I want to make my own?"	"Now I understan what my high sch history teacher was trying to dc and why I disagr with him."
3. Course as a whole-	Team teaching- each instructor teaching with different styles of leading discussions (Phases 2 and 3 with some 4	"I felt like there was like competition between you two. You were more into computers and she was more into special needs."	"Some people sai they didn't like the dual format and they really thought it shoul be taught as two courses." "Your teaching styles are just so amazingly differ ent. But that was good too because it kept me from doing 'a good guy- bad guy' thing. 'Y this teacher's extra good becau she teaches this way & therefore the other type teaching must be bad,' but I sa that both can be effective, both can work togeth

APPENDIX B: The Simmons Course (continued)

CURRICULAR PHASE	PEDAGOGICAL METHOD	MULTIPLIST	CONTEXTUALIST
4. Course as a whole-	Fieldwork Component-	"I liked the fieldwork. I really did. I enjoyed it and I liked the computers. It was a good experience for me to learn the computer part." (She did not view or evaluate the course as a whole or see the parts of the course in the context of its major theme: change.) "The only way I really learn is from doing it myself. And finding out my mistakes and correcting them. And by going to the fieldwork I can see what I'm up against and what I also have to do."	"A lot of my misconception about the teaching profession were shattered. There isn't teaching malpractice, but there's some sad things that happen and as an aide you can't go around and rectify them... I don't think until the very end, nobody really addressed the frustration of not having a role."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boxer, Marilyn, "For and About Women: The Theory and Practice of Women's Studies in the United States," Signs, Vol 7, No. 2 (Summer, 1983), pp. 661-695.

Broverman, I., Vogel, S., Broverman, D., Clarkson, F., and Rosenkrantz, P., "Sex Role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal," Journal of Social Issues, 28 , (1972): 59-78.

Clinchy, Blythe, and Zimmerman, Claire, "Epistomology and Agency in the Development of Undergraduate Women," in Perum, Pamela, ed., The Undergraduate Women, Issues in Educational Equity, Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1982, pp. 161-181.

Clinchy, Blythe, and Zimmerman, Claire, "Growing Up Intellectually, Issues for College Women," Unpublished paper, April 1984, Stone Center Colloquium Series, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA.

Freire, Paolo, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, New York, NY: Seabury, 1970.

Freedman, Sara; Jackson, Jane, and Boles, Katherine, "The Other End of the Corridor, the Effect of Teaching on Teachers," Radical Teacher, pp. 1-23.

Grumet, Madeleine, "Pedagogy for Patriarchy, the Feminization of Teaching," Interchange on Educational Policy, Vol. 12, No. 2 & 3, pp. 165-184.

Maher, Frances, "Classroom Pedagogy and the New Scholarship on Women," in Culley, Margot, ed., The Feminist Pedagogy Reader, Routledge, Kegan, and Paul, 1985, (forthcoming).

Maher, Frances and Lyman, Kathleen, "Definitions of Social Studies Concepts, A Precondition for Inquiry," Unpublished paper, December 1982.

McIntosh, Peggy, "Interactive Phases of Curricular-Revision: A Feminist Perspective, Working Paper #124: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the Anna Wilder Phelps Fund, 1983.

Perry, William G., Jr., Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development: In the College Years, A Scheme, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Porter, Nancy M. and Eileenchild, Margaret T., The Effectiveness of Women's Studies Teaching, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1980.

Spence, Janet T., Helmreich, Robert, and Stapp, Joy, "A Short Version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale," Psychonomic Society Bulletin, 1983, Vol.2(4), pp. 219-220.

Tetreault, Mary Kay, The Implementation of an Evaluation Model to Measure the Impact of a Faculty Development Seminar in Women's Studies, Paper presented at National Women's Studies Association Meeting, June 1982.

Tetreault, Mary Kay, "Feminist Phase Theory: An Experience Derived Evaluation Model," Journal of Higher Education (forthcoming).

Tyack, David, and Strober, Myra, "Why Do Women Teach and Men Manage," Signs, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 494-503.